

ACIS 85-1081/85

FYZ

Office of Legislative Liaison
Routing Slip

TO:	ACTION	INFO
1. D/OLL		X
3. DD/OLL		X
3. Admin Officer		
4. Liaison		X
5. Legislation		
6. T		X
7. W		X
8.		
9.		
10.		
SUSPENSE _____ Date _____		

Action Officer:
Remarks:

Gm / 20 Feb 85
Name/Date

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 19 Feb 1985
TO: <i>Dir</i>		
ROOM NO. <i>7B02</i>	BUILDING <i>HQS</i>	
REMARKS:		
<p>FROM: Arms Control Intelligence Staff Room 6F20, Hqs.</p>		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 85

REPLACES FORM 36-8

(47)

SECRET/NOFORN

Record
OSACIS - 1081/85
19 February 1985MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence
Director, Office of Legislative Liaison

FROM:

[REDACTED]
Chief, Arms Control Intelligence Staff

SUBJECT: Senate Arms Control Observers Group (U)

1. This memorandum is for your information. (U)
2. I participated this morning in a session with the Senate Arms Control Observers Group. Commissioner Richard Ellis (former SAC Commander) participated with me. The session consisted of two parts:
 - An intelligence briefing, lasting about thirty minutes, in which I presented the intelligence on [REDACTED] major compliance questions, as well as an overview of Soviet thoughts on arms control compliance. (This latter point is based on the SOVA typescript memorandum.).
 - A discussion by Commissioner Ellis about the activities of the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) in Geneva. The Commission meets twice a year and is the one formal arena where the US and USSR can discuss ambiguous situations, including violations.

The Senators in attendance were: Stevens, Nunn, Byrd, Kennedy, Warner, Nichols, Gore, and Pell. Three staff officers were in attendance: Punaro, Ashworth, and Bell. The intelligence portions of both presentations was straightforward, using the material which is the basis for the President's report to the Congress on compliance.

[REDACTED]

3. During Commissioner Ellis' session, a number of Senators asked me what they clearly knew to be policy questions. In most cases, I answered the intelligence portion of their question. With respect to the policy questions, I expressed a view part of the time and when I did so, I made it clear that it was my personal opinion, as opposed to a view of the Intelligence Community or the DCI. Senator Nunn particularly said he was thankful for my candor and clearly indicated that he understood the differences between my intelligence

[REDACTED]

SECRET/NOFORN

SECRET/NOFORN

briefing and my personal views. One of the personal views I gave of a policy nature, for example, was that the SCC arguably was a good idea for the US because:

- It gave us an opportunity to get from the Soviets their official view about compliance questions.
- The SCC also gave the US the opportunity to tell the Soviets officially the US Government's view about compliance questions; I said that there is no other mechanism in existence which allows the US to do so in as non-political way as possible. (S/NF)

4. If there is anything more I can do to assist you here, please call and let me know. (U)



25X1

SECRET/NOFORN

SECRET/NOFORN

ACIS - 1081/85
19 February 1985

SUBJECT: Senate Arms Control Observers Group (U)

DISTRIBUTION:

Original - DDI

1 - D/OLL

1 - [REDACTED]

25X1

1 - ExRegistry

1 - C/ACIS

1 - [REDACTED]

25X1

1 - [REDACTED]

1 - NIO/SP

1 - ACIS Chrono

DDI/ACIS

[REDACTED] 19Feb85

25X1

SECRET/NOFORN